

REMARKS

Claims 15 – 17 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3 – 11, and 18 – 27 remain pending.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings “because a power connection of the third connecting part and fourth connecting part.”

Nevertheless, applicants respectfully submit that Figures 1 and 3 need not be amended. In one embodiment, the first interface is a USB interface, and the first and second connecting parts are port 18 and connection 16. The second interface is the interface 10 that has a male connector 20 (e.g., third connecting part) and a female connector 22 (e.g., fourth connecting part). It will be appreciated that the female connector 22 may be the third connecting part and the male connector 20 may be the fourth connecting part as well.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 17 and 20 stand objected because of informalities. The Examiner states that “Claims 17 and 20 objected to because of the following informalities: claim 20 has been elected by the applicants as part of specie 1. However, they are not shown in Figure 1 and 3, thus claim 18 is also withdrawn from further

consideration... Regarding claim 17, since the digital apparatus was not positively recited in claim 17, the limitation that the digital apparatus are memory and hose devise was not considered as to further the claim and therefore given no patentable weight."

Applicants spoke with the Examiner who indicated a typographical error was made in the claim objections. Claim 20 was withdrawn from consideration (instead of claim 18.)

The applicants also believe that claim 20 should not be rejected as the first connecting part (male connector) 16 and the third connecting part (female connector) 18 are explicitly shown in Figure 1.

With respect to claim 17, Applicants note that the examiner must consider each and every limitation of the claim. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). See MPEP § 2143.03.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 9, 15, 18, 19, 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kedem (U.S. Patent No. 2005/0032419 A1, hereinafter "Kedem"). The Examiner has rejected claims 10, 11, 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kedem in view of Applicant's

Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) as disclosed on page 1 of the instant application.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 5, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kedem.

Claim 1

Applicants respectfully submit Kedem does not teach or suggest a digital apparatus comprising a dual data connector that allows data to be transferred between a host apparatus and the digital apparatus through only one of the data connectors at any one time, as required by claim 1.

In Kedem, a connector 70 with ports 25, 72 facing in different directions is disclosed. The connector allows for the connection of one peripheral device to a host device from the inside of the host device leaving a second port to connect with a similar peripheral device from the outside of the host device (para 0050). Para 0054 discloses the connection of flash memory to a port of the connector to serve as non-volatile memory for the host device. Finally, para 0038 discloses the location of ports on a common face of a connector for the connection of separate peripheral devices as part of the prior art. Pins 56 may be another interface of the connector 70 for connection to a host apparatus. Pins 56 should be connected to the host apparatus when connector 70 is in use. Neither port 25 nor port 72 is for connection to the host device.

Although para 0038 of Kedem discloses the location of ports on a common face of a connector for the connection of separate peripheral devices as part of the

prior art, it does not disclose the use of both connectors for connection to a single digital device.

Claim 1 relates to a digital apparatus comprising a dual data connector that allows data to be transferred between a host apparatus and the digital apparatus through only one of the data connectors at any one time, where both data connectors allow for connection between a host apparatus and a digital device.

Claim 18

Applicants respectfully submit Kedem does not teach or suggest a digital data storage apparatus comprising a dual data connector with a first connecting part being electrically in parallel with a third connecting part, as required by claim 18.

In Kedem, para 0054 discloses the connection of flash memory 60 to a single port of the connector 70 to serve as non-volatile memory for the host device.

Although para 0038 of Kedem discloses the location of ports on a common face of a connector for the connection of separate peripheral devices as part of the prior art, it does not disclose the use of both connectors for connection to a single digital device.

In contrast, claim 18 relates to a digital data storage apparatus comprising a dual data connector with a first connecting part being electrically in parallel

with a third connecting part. This allows for the transfer of data even when one of the connectors suffers a failure.

Claim 25

Applicants respectfully submit Kedem does not disclose or teach any method for connecting a digital apparatus to a host apparatus where dual connectors allow for the transfer of data between a host apparatus and a digital apparatus, as required by claim 25.

As discussed above, Kedem does not teach or suggest any method for connecting a digital apparatus to a host apparatus where dual connectors allow for the transfer of data between a host apparatus and a single digital apparatus.

In contrast, claim 25 relates to a method for connecting a single digital apparatus to a host apparatus, where the digital apparatus has a dual data connector.

In addition, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 18 and 25 are not obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art as the dual connector configuration enables the transfer of at least one type of signal between a host apparatus and a single digital apparatus. The difficulties in allowing this either sequentially or not have been overcome and that cannot be deemed to be obvious.

Thus, claims 1, 18 and 25 are patentable over the cited art. As claims 3 – 11, 19-24 and 25-27 are dependent on independent claims 1, 18 and 25, respectively, they are also patentable over the cited art.

Applicant, accordingly, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 9, 15, 18, 19, 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kedem. Applicant also respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 10, 11, 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kedem in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) as disclosed on page 1 of the instant application, and the rejections of claims 5, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kedem

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Stephen M. De Klerk at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account
No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested
is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account
No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 27, 2005



Stephen M. De Klerk
Reg. No. 46,503

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300